CONFIDENTIAL

DDA 77-3774

30 June 1977

MEMORANDUM FOR: Secretary, Executive Advisory Group

FROM:

John F. Blake

Deputy Director for Administration

SUBJECT:

Comparative Ranking of Senior-Graded Personnel

REFERENCE:

Memo dtd 16 Jun 77 to Sec/EAG fr D/Pers, same subj

1. Reference memorandum requests, among other things, the following:

"In addition, each Career Service Head will rank his GS-18's in order of <u>overall capability</u> (highest to lowest)[underscoring supplied] on the basis of the following suggested criteria:".

I have followed the guidance given but, in addition, I have been motivated in establishing the ranking by giving equal consideration to the fact that I am of the opinion we may be also ranking for <u>essentiality of retention</u>. In this connection, I would submit that of the <u>three criteria established</u> in paragraph 3.b. for consideration in ranking for overall capability, two of those criteria, namely numbers (1) and (3), address themselves equally if not more so to ranking for <u>essentiality of retention</u> as opposed to ranking for <u>overall</u> capability.

- 2. I adopt this position not for purposes of fighting the problem or indulging in bureaucratic subtleties but because I believe strongly that this type of justice and identification is owed to what I consider to be an extremely strong group of Office Directors in this Directorate. In certain instances the ranking for capability as opposed to retention would be the same but in other instances it could affect the sequential placement of an Office Director in the ranking list.
- 3. Based on the reasoning given above, this Directorate now presents the ranking of its Office Directors. For those who fall in the first two and the last two positions there is a short paragraph explaining the basis for the judgment. Comparative evaluation descriptors follow each name in parentheses.

DOWNGRADE TO A/IUO UPON REMOVAL OF ATT

CONFIDENTIAL



